	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	Case No. 08-13555
4	x
5	In the Matter of:
6	
7	LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC. and
8	PMC BANCORP
9	
10	Debtor.
11	x
12	
13	United States Bankruptcy Court
14	One Bowling Green
15	New York, NY 10004
16	
17	July 14, 2020
18	10:01 a.m.
19	
20	
21	BEFORE:
22	HON SHELLEY C. CHAPMAN
23	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
24	
25	ECRO: UNKNOWN

Page 2 HEARING re Doc #60632 Motion in Aid of Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures Order for Indemnification claims of the Debtors against Mortgage Loan Sellers Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	WOLLMUTH MAHER & DEUTSCH LLP
4	Attorneys for the plan administrator
5	500 5th Avenue
6	New York, NY 10110
7	
8	BY: JOSHUA SLOCUM
9	JAMES LAWLOR
10	
11	REED SMITH LLP
12	Attorney for Wintrust Mortgage Corporation
13	599 Lexington Avenue
14	New York, NY 10022
15	
16	BY: MICHAEL S. LEIB
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good morning. This is Judge Chapman.

We are here this morning for a hearing -- excuse me -- in

the Lehman Brothers case. This hearing is being conducted

entirely telephonically via the Court Solutions platform. A

recording is being made of the proceedings and a transcript

will be made available. No private recordings of the

hearing are permitted.

I have a roster of those who have signed up to participate this morning. I'm not going to take the time to go through everyone's name. I ask that anybody who speaks on the record please identify yourself and identify the party on whose behalf you are appearing, and that you do so each time you speak so that we can create an accurate record.

Who shall I hear from on behalf of Lehman?

MR. SLOCUM: May it please the Court, good

morning. This is Joshua Slocum on behalf of the plan

administrator, Lehman Brothers Holdings, Inc. With me is my

colleague, James Lawlor, also on behalf of Lehman.

THE COURT: All right, very well. We -- perhaps we should take the issue of Wintrust up first since there's been some lively and late-breaking correspondence on that.

Mr. Leib, are you there?

MR. LEIB: I am, Your Honor. Good morning.

THE COURT: All right, let me cut to the chase.

There was a back and forth that occurred with my chambers.

I am not involved in the nitty-gritty, pursuant to standard operating procedure. The bottom line was that I was informed and understood that today's hearing was only proceeding with respect to the portions of the -- the parties who had not lodged an objection to the relief requested by the plan administrator. And the rest -- the contested portion of the motion was adjourned to August 18th.

And that's where things stood until at some point yesterday when Mr. Leib, I received a copy of your letter and it appeared not everybody was on the same page and you cited back to us our own chambers rules. So, extra credit points for that.

But be that as it may, I'm not prepared to go forward on any contested portion of the motion today. And I don't -- I mean, certainly we can look at alternate dates. That's not a problem. And I've done this before in terms of dealing with parties who were disinclined to participate in mediation for one or another reason, and I have found that discussions are useful. I don't see any, you know, dark ulterior motive here that Lehman is pursuing. I'm not going to direct that you do any mediation or ADR until we resolve this.

So, I'd like to not have an extended debate over whether or not it's going -- the hearing's going to go forward because, frankly, you can't have a hearing unless I'm willing to hear you. So, I think we ought to focus on just picking an alternate date, which we can try to do now or you can separately reach out to Mr. Slocum and his colleagues to find a date that suits your schedule.

MR. LEIB: I understand, Your Honor. And I'll give you 20 seconds and then I'll move on because I understand that you want to. We're just a little frustrated because when you do read our objection, you'll find out that over a year ago, we were sent a demand. We did provide them with information showing that we're not the successor. We provided them with a copy of the relevant portion of an asset purchase agreement, and they never got back to us. They never said anything, and they filed this motion and tried to paint everybody as being recalcitrant and uncooperative. And that really -- that hit us the wrong way. And we wanted to go forward, get this behind us.

We're in settlement negotiations with the main case that we actually are the successor for, and we didn't want this issue clouding it, and that's why we wanted to get it resolved. I understand you're not prepared to move forward but I also wanted to let Your Honor know that we were very cooperative. We provided them with information.

So, as you're reading the motion, don't think -- because we are involved with you with other business, and we don't want you to think that we were uncooperative. We provided them with the information. They never got back to us, then they filed this motion. So, I'll move on.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I appreciate that.

I appreciate that. Let me assure you that -- there are always two sides of a story. I would not be really effective at my job if I believed everything that everybody said. So, I assure you that I will maintain an open mind and, you know, we can take this up at the next juncture if you don't -- if you aren't able to work something out.

There have in the past, when we -- and we've done many of these -- that, you know, there are modifications that satisfy the concerns. I will say, though, that something to think about is that the -- not many folks are -- a fair number of folks are not very enthusiastic about participating in ADR when their fundamental belief is that they don't belong in one of these lawsuits. Successor defense seems to be something that people are particularly keen on asserting as a Get-Out-of-Jail-Free card, so to speak. Similarly, we've had folks assert, you know, statute of limitations or other things in the nature of defense that they feel very strongly entitles them to not participate.

So, I hear you and why don't we just leave it at

that and see what you folks can work out? Rather than take up everyone else's time on this hearing, why don't you reach out to the Lehman folks and try to work out a date that works for you? I would -- the reason that we opted for the procedure that we did was because we find that it's helpful to adjourn these matters all to the same date if they can't be resolved. But, look, if that's not possible, we'll give you a date that works for you.

MR. LEIB: I appreciate that, Your Honor. I do want to be clear that this is not an issue of -- you know, trying to avoid something. We did provide the information to Lehman and they never got back to us in providing contrary evidence. They didn't tell Your Honor in the motion that we had presented evidence that we were not the successor. And we did reach out --

THE COURT: All right, let me stop you because if you keep talking they're going to insist that they rebut your statements, and I need to move on. I've got a big hearing in the queue for 11 o'clock.

MR. LEIB: Okay.

THE COURT: So, we'll leave it there.

MR. LEIB: I'm happy with either picking a date now or if it's more efficient to try and find a date that all counsel -- or all the objectors can be involved in.

Then we can work with Lehman to find a date that everybody

can appear at.

THE COURT: Okay, great. Why don't you do that offline so that I can keep going here? You're welcome to stay on or you can disconnect if you like.

MR. LEIB: I appreciate that. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Mr. Slocum, let me go back to you now and have you make a record with respect to the uncontested portion of this motion.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, Your Honor. Again, Joshua Slocum for Lehman. This motion -- we served this motion on upwards of 50 potential successors that have acquired or purchased in some way an interest in mortgage loan sellers that sold loans to Lehman Brothers. Only eight successors have objected. And so, accordingly, yesterday I filed a certificate of no objection for all of the -- lifting all of the -- well, potential successors. Again, this motion is entirely without prejudice to the defense about whether there actually is successor liability. So when I say successors I mean that without any prejudice to that defense, which would be preserved by each of them.

But as to those potential successors who have not objected, I filed a certificate of no objection. For the reasons state in our motion papers, we believe that the ADR orders -- and there have been several over the years -- that have been entered by this Court have been a resounding

success. I would submit for all parties involved, Lehman has been able to settle dozens of claims over the years much more cheaply and efficiently than would've been possible through litigation. This benefits not only the Lehman estate and its creditors but the counterparties as well. Even in cases where the parties have been far apart at first, having a neutral sophisticated third party involved in the discussion has been a tremendous benefit in terms of educating the parties about the strengths and weaknesses of their case and bringing them together toward a resolution, if that is possible.

We believe this motion in aid of ADR procedures is a continuation of that. The purpose of this motion is because, as Your Honor is aware, this case has a long procedural history. Lehman resolved certain claims by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac back in 2014 and brought indemnification claims against mortgage loan sellers in connection with those settlements.

The Court previously entered an ADR order not only for the mortgage loan sellers themselves but also for potential successors to those loan sellers. That order was entered in late 2015. And then in 2018, the Lehman estate finally came to a resolution with the trustees of residential mortgage-backed securities where Lehman had purchased loans and then securitized them in various trusts.

That also has a very long history but it ultimately ended with this Court's order estimating Lehman's liability as to those claims. It was set at 2.38 billion. Lehman, accordingly, has pursued, since that time, indemnification claims against mortgage loan sellers and potential successors to mortgage loan sellers who sold loans that gave rise to that liability. This motion in aid of ADR is targeted toward the latter group, the potential successors to the mortgage loan sellers who sold loans that were securitized in -- as residential mortgage-backed securities.

So, this is a very large volume of claims. As the Court knows, there are dozens and dozens of active cases around and because of the efficiency that is provided by mediation and the success that Lehman has seen over the years in these ADR proceedings, we submit that this order should be entered to facilitate organized settlement discussions with experienced third party mediators that could help to reduce the number of claims that Lehman has out there, that would benefit creditors with a sooner payout on the monies that are owed to them by the estate, and to benefit the counterparties as well because mediation is a much cheaper, more streamlined and more economical way to resolve claims than active litigation, which can take years and has taken years before this Court. As we know, we are sitting here in a bankruptcy that started in 2008.

So, that is an amplification of the reasons given in our brief for why we believe this order should be entered substantially in the form that was tendered to the Court, putting aside the objecting parties. And I would note that Lehman is in discussions with those -- certain of those objecting parties and is hopeful of resolving certain of those objections as well. So, that is merely a side note. So, with that, I will pause, answer any questions Your Honor may have. But we submit that the order should be entered. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, thank you very much for the

THE COURT: All right, thank you very much for the trip down Memory Lane. We have been doing these cases for a long time and I agree with your characterization of the usefulness of the ADR procedures. So, I don't have any additional questions. I'll just ask generally, since other folks have signed up for the hearing, if anyone else wishes to be heard with respect to the relief requested by the plan administrator. All right, very well.

I think we do have a copy in Word of the order and the exhibit that we should enter. Can you confirm that that's the case, Mr. Slocum?

MR. SLOCUM: If it is not, I will immediately email a Word copy to your chambers. I'm not sure (indiscernible) provided with PDF or Word, so I don't want to make that --

Page 13 1 THE COURT: Yeah, yeah, why don't you -- why don't 2 you just go ahead and send it. I don't think that we -- I 3 don't think that we have it. So, get that sent over to us 4 and we'll get it on the docket ASAP. And if you would, 5 after you talk to Mr. Leib -- you know, it may be hard to 6 get everybody together for the same date but, you know, do 7 your best and just reach out to chambers and we'll give you whatever other dates that you need. I will not take the 8 9 18th off the calendar yet, you know, and you can just let us 10 know as soon as you figure it out. 11 MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, Your Honor. We will do 12 that. 13 THE COURT: All right. Very well. Thank you very 14 much, everyone. Stay safe. Have a good day. This 15 concludes the hearing. Thank you. 16 17 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 18 10:17 AM) 19 20 21 22 23 24

Page 14 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing 4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. 5 Sonya M. deslarati Hyde 6 7 8 Sonya Ledanski Hyde 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Veritext Legal Solutions 21 330 Old Country Road 22 Suite 300 23 Mineola, NY 11501 24 25 Date: July 16, 2020